

* * *

Case No. 3:20-CV-0079-MMD-CLB

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO COMPEL

[ECF Nos. 155/156, 174]

Defendants.

If the meet and confer efforts are unsuccessful, the party seeking to compel discovery, or a protective order, may file a discovery motion. All motions to compel discovery, or for a protective order, must set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and any response to it. Discovery motions will not be considered unless the movant (1) has made a good faith effort to meet and confer as defined in LR IA 1-3(f) before filing the motion, and (2) includes a declaration setting forth the details and results

¹ The Court construes Welch's supporting motion to compel, (ECF No. 156), as points and authorities in support of his motion to compel. (ECF No. 155.)

1 of the meet-and confer conference about each disputed discovery request. LR 26-6(b) &
2 (c).

3 Welch's motions to compel are difficult to follow. However, it appears that Welch
4 asserts Defendants have not properly responded to requests for admissions and/or
5 requests for documents. While it appears Welch may have sent a letter requesting a meet
6 and confer, there is no declaration attached outlining the results of the meet and confer
7 or even if such a conference took place. Therefore, it appears Welch failed to comply with
8 Local Rules IA 1-3(f)(1) and 26(b) and (c) prior to filing the instant motions.

9 In addition, Welch does not set forth or state the responses to the requests for
10 admission or documents which he seeks the Court to compel in either of his motions.
11 (ECF Nos. 155, 156, 174.) Defendants state in their opposition, (ECF No. 164), that Welch
12 served several sets of requests for admissions on different Defendants in October 2021
13 and all of those were responded to in November 2021.

14 The Court appreciates the difficulties that pro se litigants face representing
15 themselves. However, pro se litigants, like all other litigants, are required to follow the
16 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules for the District of Nevada when
17 litigating their case in this district. See *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir.1987)
18 ("Pro se litigants must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants.")
19 (citation omitted), *overruled on other grounds*, *Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.3d 896
20 (9th Cir. 2012). The Court reminds Welch of these obligations and encourages him to
21 review the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules for the District of Nevada
22 pertaining to discovery prior to filing additional discovery motions as he is required to
23 comply with these rules while litigating his case.

24 Therefore, for the reasons stated above, Welch's motions to compel are **DENIED**.
25 (ECF Nos. 155/156, 174.) To the extent the motions request sanctions, the requests are
26 also **DENIED**.

27 **DATED:** January 6, 2022.

28 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE